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On-going OECD project on The Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework: Targets, indicators and measurability implications at global and national level

• Objective
  – Examine options to enhance the measurability of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

• OECD background paper – prepared for the OECD international expert workshop on February 26, 2019
  – International context
  – Environmental targets and indicators
    • Principles, criteria, concepts
  – The Aichi Biodiversity Targets and current set of indicators
    • Overview and lessons learned
  – Recent developments and proposals
    • CBD submissions, NGO proposal, OECD proposal, other.

with support from the European Commission
Pressure-State-Response framework and the theory of change

Source: OECD (2019), The Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework: Targets, indicators and measurability implications at global and national level. [Background paper prepared for the OECD workshop, February 26, 2019]
## Types of policy responses (or actions) and the theory of change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Input**      | Measure the material and immaterial pre-conditions and resources - both human and financial - provided for an activity, project, programme or intervention | • Budget allocated for biodiversity  
• Number of staff                                                                                 |
| **Process**    | Measure the progress of processes or actions that use inputs and ways in which program services and goods are provided                                                                                     | • Establish an inter-Ministerial Committee for biodiversity                                    |
| **Output**     | Measure the quantity, quality, and efficiency of production of goods or services as a result of an activity, project, programme or intervention                                                        | • New legal or policy instruments  
• Studies such as National Ecosystem Assessments  
• Biodiversity and ecosystem values are integrated into national accounts                      |
| **Outcome**    | Measure the intermediate broader results achieved through the provision of outputs                                                                                                                        | • Reduced pesticide use  
• Larger protected areas                                                                         |
| **Impact**     | Measure the quality and quantity of long-term results generated as a result of achieving specific outcomes                                                                                            | • Improved condition of biodiversity and sustainability of ecosystem services, such as number of threatened species |

Source: Adapted from OECD (2018), *Mainstreaming Biodiversity for Sustainable Development*
Some lessons from the 2011-2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets

• Lessons:
  – Covers pressures, state and responses
  – But... Linguistic ambiguity
  – Difficult to track progress in a consistent and comparable way across countries
  – Uptake of CBD indicators at the national level is limited

• Calls for:
  – SMARTer targets (with associated indicators)
  – Targets and indicators to be developed at same time
## Characteristics of the 2011-2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aichi Target</th>
<th>Pressure-State-Response</th>
<th>Input-Process-Output-Outcome-Impact</th>
<th>Quantified or quantitatively specific target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Input, process (and outcome but not defined)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>State (and Pressure)</td>
<td>Output and outcome</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Response, Pressure, State</td>
<td>Output and outcome</td>
<td>Implicitly (100% target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Implicitly (100% target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implicitly (100% target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>State, Response</td>
<td>Process and output</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Yes, partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Implicitly and partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>State, Response</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>State, Response</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Partially (15% restoration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Yes, binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Yes, binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Input</td>
<td>No but yes in further decisions (i.e. doubling)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OECD (2019), The Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework: Targets, indicators and measurability implications at global and national level. [Background paper prepared for the workshop]
Evaluating progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets


Evaluating progress towards Green Growth

Figure 4.1. Nutrient surpluses declined

Source: OECD (2017), Green Growth Indicators 2017
The current indicator suite to monitor progress towards the Aichi Targets

• CBD Dec XIII/28
  - 98 indicative indicators
  - 35 highlighted as having *potential* for disaggregation at national level

• Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)
  - 64 indicators
  - Many highlighted as being ‘applicable at national level’
Possible *categories* of indicators for the post-2020 framework, including headline indicators

Potential categories of indicators for the post-2020 biodiversity framework

- **Quantified headline indicators**
  - Covering pressure, state, and response (e.g., including output and outcome responses)

- **Larger set of accompanying indicators**
  - Covering pressure, state, response variables

- **Other indicators**, e.g., for enabling conditions and/or the process (response) indicators? e.g.
  - Public awareness, communication, NBSAPs, good governance

  - **e.g., 5 to 20/30 indicators**, with data that is consistent and comparable across countries

  - **e.g., many more indicators**, with data that is not necessarily comparable across all countries

  - **e.g., response indicators** – predominantly inputs and processes?

Source: Adapted from OECD (2019), *The post-2020 biodiversity framework: targets, indicators and measurability implications at global and national level. [Background paper for the workshop]*
Possible *categories* of indicators for the post-2020 framework, including headline indicators

- **Targets on State**
  - With a focussed set of agreed headline indicators and a broader set of other non-headline indicators

- **Targets on Pressures**
  - With a focussed set of agreed headline indicators and a broader set of other non-headline indicators

- **Targets on Responses** i.e. *ACTIONS*
  - With a focussed set of agreed headline indicators and a broader set of other non-headline indicators

- **Targets on other responses** i.e. *enabling conditions* e.g. governance, capacity...

**Headline indicators** for state, pressure and response targets

- Measurable in a consistent and comparable way across countries
- Could therefore *add up* across countries to examine whether we are on track to meet the relevant global post-2020 target

Source: Adapted from OECD (2019), The post-2020 biodiversity framework: targets, indicators and measurability implications at global and national level. [Background paper for the workshop]
Possible headline indicators...

- More than 50 multi-country datasets, relevant to biodiversity, identified so far...

Examples of possible headline indicators

State: Threatened species
State: Wetland extent trends index
Pressure: Land cover change
Pressure: Deforestation
Pressure: Pesticide use (or sales) per hectare
Response (output): Aichi Target 3 indicators on positive incentives
Response (outcome): Protected area coverage
Response (input): Finance
Key messages from the OECD workshop

- Aichi Biodiversity Targets relatively complicated; language often ambiguous – advocate for greater simplicity in post-2020 framework
- Post-2020 targets and indicators should build on current framework, building on areas of success, and should be developed in parallel, in an iterative manner
- Introducing potential categories of indicators, including headline indicators, can compliment on-going discussions on the “structure” of the framework
- Many multi-country datasets already exist (covering pressure, state and response indicators) that would enable the monitoring of progress towards targets in a way that is comparable and consistent across countries
- Need further analysis on indicators. They are the cornerstone of the post-2020 biodiversity framework
- Mainstreaming targets and associated indicators needs more attention, as do enabling conditions.
OECD International Expert Workshop
February 26, 2019

www.oecd/post-2020-biodiversity-workshop

• Summary record – including background paper
• Agenda
• Presentations
• Participants’ list
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